

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20, 24-26 and 28-36 are now in the case. Claim 20 has been amended to specify that the carrier can be phosphate or a mixture of zeolite A and phosphate. Basis is at page 11, line 9 (zeolite A) and in original Claim 23. Claim 24 has been amended for clarity with respect to the use of carbonate with the builders of Claim 23. Likewise, Claim 33 has been amended to properly depend from Claim 24. Claim 36 has been amended to depend from Claim 20, rather than from now-canceled Claim 22. It is submitted that all amendments are fully supported, and entry is requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 20-26 and 28-37 stand rejected over GB 2,297,977 A, for reasons of record at pages 2-4 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections on this basis, to the extent they may apply to the claims as amended herewith.

GB '977 relates to the use of clay in combination with zeolite MAP to address the problem of color abrasion and to provide a softening effect (page 2). Inorganic clay flocculants, including lime and alum, can be used in the compositions (page 11).

However, it is submitted that nothing in GB '977 teaches or suggests the use of phosphate builder or a mixture of zeolite A and phosphate builder, together with the clay and the flocculants, as now recited in the present claims.

The Examiner takes the position (O.A. , p. 3) that GB '977 teaches phosphate as a conventional builder. It is submitted that this is not relevant to the amended claims, since it is the use of phosphate plus clay plus the alum or lime that is at issue.

Likewise, the mere fact that zeolite A is a known builder (GB '977 at p. 2) does not suggest the combination of zeolite A plus phosphate plus clay plus the alum or lime, in the manner of the present invention.

Indeed, zeolite A is taught by GB '977 (p. 2, l. 1-3) to be a replacement for inorganic phosphates. (The same is known to be true for zeolite MAP.) Accordingly, there is no suggestion in this document to combine any zeolite with phosphate and to further add clay and either lime or alum to the combination.

In summary, it is submitted that GB'977 constitutes a mere catalogue of ingredients that does not render the instant invention obvious in the sense of 35 USC 103. See *Ex parte Hiyamizu*, 10 USPQ 2d. 1393, 1394 (BPAI, 1988). Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections under §103.

Appl. No. 09/936,403
Atty. Docket No. CM2083
Amdt. dated 2/26/2004
Reply to Office Action of 01/02/04
Customer No. 27752

In light of the foregoing, early and favorable action in the case is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Hall et al.

By



Jerry J. Yetter
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 26,598
(513) 627-1907

February 26, 2004
Customer No. 27752
(CM2083 RCE Amendment-Response to Office Action.doc)
Revised 10/14/2003